

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Application No. 10/536,853 </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Applicant(s) AZNAR, PASCAL </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Examiner BRITTANY M. MARTINEZ </td> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Art Unit 1793 </td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/536,853	Applicant(s) AZNAR, PASCAL	Examiner BRITTANY M. MARTINEZ	Art Unit 1793
Application No. 10/536,853	Applicant(s) AZNAR, PASCAL				
Examiner BRITTANY M. MARTINEZ	Art Unit 1793				

All Participants:

(1) BRITTANY M. MARTINEZ.

(2) Mr. Pehr Jansson.

Status of Application: Response to non-final Office action entered and forwarded to examiner

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 June 2010

Time: 4:20 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

13, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Kanda et al. (US 6,360,589 B1) (of record) and Watanabe et al. (Journal of Bacteriology) (of record)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Brittany M Martinez/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested adding "a material consisting essentially of" before "spherical and porous silica gel" in Claims 13 and 19 and "a material consisting essentially of" before "semi-spherical and porous silica gel" in Claims 16 and 22 in order to exclude bonded or coated silica gels such as that disclosed by Kanda. The examiner further suggested adding "consisting of a size" after "particle size" in Claims 13, 16, 19 and 22 in order to exclude silica gels with many particles with a size outside the claimed range such as that disclosed by Watanabe. The examiner also made the following claim amendment suggestions: in Claim 19, line 6, delete "flash chromatography tube" and substitute with - low-pressure glass tube or syringe body - -; in Claim 20, line 1, delete "The method of purifying a product of Claim 19" and substitute with - - The pre-filled flash chromatography column according to Claim 19- -; in Claim 22, line 6, delete "flash chromatography tube" and substitute with - - low-pressure glass tube or syringe body - -; and in Claim 23, line 1, delete "The method of purifying a product of Claim 22" and substitute with - - The pre-filled flash chromatography column according to Claim 22- -. Mr. Jansson indicated that he would discuss the aforementioned potential claim amendments with Applicant and then get back to the examiner.